	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/924,158	SAYYAH, KEYVAN			
Offic Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit			
•	Thao P Le	2818			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 A</u>	August 2001 .				
	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allows	ance except for forma	al matters, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application		`			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requiremen	1ι.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ır.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		o by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to th					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in re					
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been receive	d.			
2. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been receive	d in Application No			
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
14)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest					
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲 No	erview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) tice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) ner:			

Application/Control Number: 09/924,158

Art Unit: 2818

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Application claimed as a continuation-in-part of the prior application No. 09/728639 filed November 29, 2000, now became U.S. Patent No. 6,291,266.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-21 of U. S. Patent No. 6291266 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: Claim 1 in the Patent 6,291,266 ('266) contain all claimed limitations in claims 1 and 2 in application 09/924,158 ('158). Claim 1 in '266

Application/Control Number: 09/924,158 Page 3

Art Unit: 2818

includes the steps that recited in claim 1 of '158 comprising the steps of providing a substrate with a release member disposed upon a surface of the original substrate, the circuit elements having been fabricated on top surface of the release member, forming individual elements having a conical frustum-shaped configuration, fabricating a first set of electrically conductive contacts on a surface of individual elements, the first set of electrically conductive contacts being concentrically disposed rings, removing the release member, freeing the conical frustum-shaped elements, defining frustum-shaped individual element receptors which is sized to receive the conical frustum-shaped individual elements... Claim 1 of '266 also includes the steps I and m in claim 2 of '158. Claims 2-21 in '266 also contain limitations that recited in claims 3-21 of '158. Claim 1 of '266 discloses that the first and second sets of contacts are metallization. Claim 1 of '158 discloses the sets of contacts are conductive. It would have been obvious that metal material would have been conducted.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thao P Le whose telephone number is 703-605-1187. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (8:00-6:30).

Application/Control Number: 09/924,158

Art Unit: 2818

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on 703-308-4910. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Thao Phuong Le April 17, 2002 HOAI HO PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 4



Creation date: 14-08-2003

Indexing Officer: KPHAM2 - KAREN PHAM

Team: OIPEBackFileIndexing

Dossier: 09924158

Legal Date: 03-04-2003

Total number of pages: 7

No.	Doccode	Number of pages	
1	CTNF	6	
2	892	1	

Remarks:		,	
Order of re-scan	issued on		